

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trad mark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/851,639 05/09/01 **ADAMS** 010629 **EXAMINER** PM82/1004 LYNN J. ALSTADT BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C. SECUMINY. PAPER NUMBER ONE OXFORD CENTRE Ú 301 GRANT STREET, 20TH FLOOR PITTSBURGH PA 15219 DATE MARED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

10/04/01

. Öffice Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/851,639	ADAMS, WILLIAM E.
	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE f this communication app	Jon A Szumny ears on the cover sheet with the c	3632
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2001</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No		
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 		
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).		
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. 		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)
S Patent and Trademark Office		

Art Unit: 3632

This is the first office action for application number 09/851,639, Suction Holder for Razor, filed on May 9, 2001.

Priority

Priority of Provisional Application number 60/203,856 filed on May 12, 2000 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

Receipt is acknowledged of Form PTO-1449, <u>Information Disclosure Statement</u>, which has been reviewed by the Examiner.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 4, the last line, "my" should be --may--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3632

Regarding claims 2-4, it is not clear exactly which "multi-sided cross-section" is being referred to. However, for the purposes of this office action, it will be assumed that both of the multi-sided cross-sections are being referred to.

With respect to claim 11, it appears the "flag" has been doubly included in lines 1 and 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent number 5,961,087 to Lee.

Lee '087 discloses a holder and flag (figure 2) comprising a suction cup (10) having cup and neck portions (figure 1), wherein the neck has a transverse bore (figure 2) having a multi-sided cross section, and a flag (101) having a display portion attached to a pole (figure 1), a portion of the pole having a multi-sided cross section complementary to that of the bore and fitted within the bore so it can be rotated therein so that in each position every side of the portion of the pole is opposite a side of the bore.

Art Unit: 3632

Claim R jections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent number Des. 388,271 to Moore in view of U.S. Patent number 5,323,996 to Rendall, and further in view of U.S. Patent number 5,313,734 to Roberts.

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Moore '271 discloses a holder (figure 1) including an attachment device (figure 1) having a neck (figure 1) containing at least one bore (figure 1), and a ring (figure 1) whereby the ring is rotated within the bore. However, Moore '271 fails to specifically teach the attachment device to be a suction cup or the ring to be a split ring with two ends each fitted within the bore.

Rendall '996 reveals a holder (figure 7) comprising a suction cup (103) having a neck with a bore, and a split ring having two ends each fitted within the bore. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the attachment device of Moore '271 with the suction cup of Rendall '996 so as to provide an operator with a quickly attachable/detachable but sturdy attachment means. Further, it would have been obvious to replace the ring of Moore '271 with the split ring of Rendall '996 so as to allow for quick disengagement of the ring from the attachment device without having to detach an object being held on the ring from the ring, in addition to reducing materials costs.

Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996 divulge the previously described invention failing to specifically teach the cross sections of the bore and two ends of the split ring to be multi-sided complementary cross-sections. However, Roberts '734 reveals a holder (figure 1) having an end with a multi-sided cross section (38) being fitted with a bore with a complementary multi-sided cross-section (46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the circular cross-sections of the bore and two ends of the ring of Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996 with multi-sided cross-sections as in Roberts '734 so as to allow an operator to effectively position the ring at a desired position while preventing pivoting of the ring to another position.

With respect to claims 2-4, Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996, and further in view of Roberts '734 divulge the previous invention failing to specifically teach the cross-sections to be square, hexagonal or octagonal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the cross-sections of the bore and the ends of the split ring could be constructed to be any of a number of different shapes, including square, hexagonal and octagonal, so long as the ring does not inadvertently pivot from a desired position.

Regarding claim 7, Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996, and further in view of Roberts '734 divulge the previous invention failing to specifically teach the at least one bore to be a pair of bores on a common axis being separated by a web. However, Rendall '996 teaches the previously described holder (figure 7), having a pair of bores (123) on a common axis being separated by a web. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the at least one bore of Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996, and further in view of Roberts '734 with a pair of bores on a common axis being separated by a web as in Rendall '996 so as to provide a stopping point for the ends of the split ring so as not to induce excess stress upon the ring which could lead to failure of the ring.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996, and further in view of Roberts '734, and further in view of U.S. Patent number 6,131,865 to Adams.

Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996, and further in view of Roberts '734 divulge the previous invention failing to specifically teach the suction cup to be made of soft vinyl or the ring to comprise polypropylene or polycarbonate. However, Adams '865 teaches a holder having a soft vinyl suction cup (column 4, lines 10-11) and a polycarbonate ring (column 3, lines 64-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to manufacture the suction cup and ring of Moore '271 in view of Rendall '996, and further in view of Roberts '734 of soft vinyl and polycarbonate, respectively, as in Adams '865 so as to provide for improved gripping strength of the suction cup, and to provide for a resilient but sturdy ring.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent number 5,078,356 to Adams in view of Lee '087.

Adams '356 discloses a holder (figure 3) comprising a suction cup (26) having cup and neck portions, the neck containing a transverse bore, and a J-hook (18) having

two ends, a portion thereof, having a head adjacent thereof, being fitted within the bore so that the hook can be rotated within the bore from a first position to a second position such that in each position every side of the portion of the hook is opposite a side of the bore.

However, Adams '356 fails to specifically teach the cross sections of the bore and the portion of the hooked fitted within the bore to be complementary multi-sided cross sections. Lee '087 divulges the previously described bore and portion having multi-sided cross-sections. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the cross sections of the bore and portion of Adams '356 with the multi-sided cross sections of Lee '087 in order to allow a user to effectively position the hook at a desired position while preventing accidental pivoting of the hook.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ziskind '366, Dinstbir '330, Spira '279, Feinberg '485, Yemini '884 and Lee '305 divulge various holders.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jon A Szumny whose telephone number is (703) 306-3403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding are assigned is (703) 305-7687.

Art Unit: 3632

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is

(703) 308-1113.

D

Jon Szumny Patent Examiner Technology Center 3600 Art Unit 3632 September 29, 2001 Anta T.

Page 8

PRIMARY EXAMINER

